



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1002/wps.20408](https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20408)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Garety, P. A., & Hardy, A. (2017). The clinical relevance of appraisals of psychotic experiences. *World Psychiatry*, 16(2), 140-141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20408>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The clinical relevance of appraisals of psychotic experiences

It is not psychotic experiences in themselves but the way in which we appraise, or make sense of, them that determines their clinical relevance, and provides the key focus of psychological therapy. Psychotic experiences do not inevitably cause distress, impair functioning or result in psychiatric diagnosis. Extensive empirical findings indicate that these experiences can occur in the absence of a “need for care”¹.

What, therefore, determines clinical pathological outcomes? Cognitive models of psychosis² outline how the appraisals which people make shape both the content of psychotic experiences and the meaning that is attributed to them, bridging the gap between phenomenological and neurobiological accounts of their occurrence³. Characteristic appraisals, for example, of psychotic experiences as betokening threat, and rendering the self as vulnerable or worthless, are associated with need for care. These appraisals in turn are influenced by the psychological (i.e., cognitive, affective and behavioural) processes which have developed in the context of a person’s genes, biology and socio-environmental experiences⁴.

A case example illustrates our proposition. James grew up in poverty, experienced bullying and was raped during his teenage years. These early experiences led to distressing beliefs that he was weak and others would harm him, and he tended to be alert to potential threats. As adolescence developed into adulthood, jobless, James became increasingly isolated and rarely went outside. James felt very on-edge, and his sleep was disturbed. One day, he heard whispers that sounded critical, which he was sure were people talking about him. He became more anxious and struggled to take care of himself. He started using cannabis. The voices suddenly got more intense, telling him “you are nothing and are going to get it”. James just knew this was a sign he would never escape others’ persecution, and he became even more guarded and avoidant. James felt completely helpless and had no hope for his future.

James’s difficulties highlight how adverse life experiences contribute to negative appraisals about the self and others, which can – in the presence of a range of affective, cognitive, behavioural, social and biological factors – trigger and shape psychotic experiences and the meaning that is attributed to them. James’s voices reflect the themes of how he views himself and others; and his appraisals (“I am cursed”) and their consequences (“I am helpless”) also mirror his negative beliefs.

But note it is not just the content of appraisals that is of clinical relevance, but also the processes by which people reach such conclusions and how they react to them. A certain type of thinking style, *fast thinking*⁵, is particularly associated with threatening appraisals in psychosis, and is characterised by a tendency to “jump to conclusions”, to have high conviction in one’s instincts, and to fail to consider alternative explanations⁶. Worry and ruminative thinking further maintain distressing interpretations, together with threat-focused attention, memory biases and understandable, but unhelpful, avoidant “safety behaviours” which act to prevent disconfirmation of fears⁶.

The focus of cognitive-behavioural therapy for psychosis (CBTp) is therefore on understanding and exploring these appraisals of psychotic experiences and the thinking contributing to them, with the goal of supporting people to become less distressed and more able to live a personally meaningful life. The evidence base for CBTp is now consistent in demonstrating benefits for psychotic symptoms⁷. Developing trust and safety in the therapeutic relationship is the foundation of CBTp, as for other therapies, and requires skilful competence, given the nature of people’s beliefs and the marked interpersonal difficulties they have often experienced.

An empathic and collaborative approach is essential, conveying a spirit of open enquiry, including the “suspension of disbelief” regarding the veracity of appraisals⁸. Directly

challenging these appraisals and presenting contradictory evidence is counter-therapeutic, as it risks invalidating people's subjective experience, and may paradoxically increase their conviction and distress.

However, empathic engagement alone is insufficient to bring about clinically significant improvements in people with psychosis. A key mechanism of change in CBTp, consistent with psychodynamic approaches, is the development of reflective functioning or the ability to make sense of one's own mind and that of others, in order to understand behaviour⁹. Specifically, belief flexibility or *slow thinking* is fundamental to adaptive psychological functioning, and involves reflective curiosity and generation of alternative ideas⁵. There is now evidence that therapy which targets improvements in belief flexibility specifically diminishes paranoia¹⁰.

So, whilst a developmental perspective is valuable in aiding self-understanding, the key therapeutic focus is on identifying and modifying day-to-day cycles which maintain occurrence of distressing appraisals of psychotic experiences. As well as fast thinking processes, these include sensitivity to stress, threat anticipation, negative affect, ruminative worrying and safety behaviours⁶.

The synthesis of an individualized narrative provides an account of the range of probable factors that contribute to distressing appraisals, with the goal of increasing people's awareness of the mechanisms by which they attribute meaning to their experiences. CBTp can be seen as a process of "sowing seeds" to support the germination of alternative, less distressing explanations, which over time become more adaptive appraisals of PEs¹¹. This then supports behavioural experimentation in daily life, to explore the impact of modifying these and trying out different ways of managing stressful, but valued activities, with experiential learning gradually reinforcing safer appraisals of experience.

CBTp mirrors the naturalistic process through which we derive meaning from our life experiences to support adaptive functioning. However, sustaining this without support, given heightened vulnerability to stress, is a significant challenge. An important target for future research is the facilitation of enduring generalization of therapy gains to everyday life. To address this, our research team is trialling a digital therapy called *SlowMo* that targets problematic fast thinking to modify distressing appraisals of psychotic experiences and thereby reduce paranoia¹⁰. A *SlowMo* mobile app (see www.slowmotherapy.co.uk) assists people to *slow down for a moment* in their daily life to notice new information and develop safer thoughts, thereby aiming to optimize the clinical relevance of adaptive appraisals of psychotic experiences to real life.

Philippa A Garety^{1,2}, Amy Hardy¹

¹Department of Psychology, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, London, UK; ²NIHR Biomedical Research Centre for Mental Health, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

P. Garety acknowledges support from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre for Mental Health at the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London.

1. Linscott RJ, van Os J. Psychol Med 2013;43:1133-49.
2. Garety PA, Kuipers E, Fowler D et al. Psychol Med 2001;31:189-95.
3. Howes OD, Nour M. World Psychiatry 2016;15:3-4.
4. Peters E, Ward T, Jackson M et al. World Psychiatry 2016;15:41-52.
5. Kahneman D. Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 2011
6. Garety P, Freeman D. Br J Psychiatry 2013;203:327-33.
7. van der Gaag M, Valmaggia L, Smit F. Schizophr Res 2014;156:30-7.
8. Garety P. World Psychiatry 2015;14:180-1.

9. Fonagy P, Gergely G, Jurist E et al. Affect regulation, mentalization and the development of the self. New York: Other Press, 2002.
10. Garety P, Waller H, Emsley R et al. Schizophr Bull 2015;41:400-10.
11. Moritz S, Andreou C, Schneider BC et al. Clin Psychol Rev 2014;34:358-66.